

NEMT - RFP

Technical and Cost Proposal Summary

6 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	1200	3807.5	1st	
MTM	2680	1010	3690	2nd	MO Call Center
		986	3666	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	1050	3605.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	1066	3529.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	905	2820	6th	

3 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
TMS	2607.5	600	3207.5	1st	
MTM	2680	525	3205	2nd	MO Call Center
		512	3192	3rd	DSM Call Center
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	546	3101.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	563	3026.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	459	2374	6th	

1 - Year

	Total Technical Proposal	Total Cost Proposal	TOTAL COMBINED SCORE	Rank	
MTM	2680	176	2856	1st	MO Call Center
		171	2851	2nd	DSM Call Center
TMS	2607.5	200	2807.5	3rd	
AMR Access 2 Care	2555.5	182	2737.5	4th	
LogistiCare	2463.5	198	2661.5	5th	
Ride Source	1915	150	2065	6th	

NEMT Brokerage: RFP MED-10-011
Cost Proposals Comparison

5.4.3 Scoring of Bidder Cost Proposals

The bid with the lowest cost will receive the full point score available (200) for the cost proposal. In order to calculate every other bidder's score, the lowest bidder's cost proposal will be divided into the corresponding value of the other bidder(s) and then multiplied by the maximum points. The formula for each is expressed as follows:

$$\text{Bidder's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost} / \text{Bidder Cost}) \times \text{Maximum Points}$$

<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Year 1</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Year 3</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Year 5</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Year 6</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>Total Pts.</u>	<u>Div. By 6</u>
TMS Management Group, Inc.	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.14	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	\$ 2.01	200	1,200	200
LogistiCare	\$ 2.16	198	\$ 2.32	184	\$ 2.37	181	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.41	167	1,066	178
Access2Care Transportation Solutions	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.35	182	\$ 2.38	169	\$ 2.40	168	\$ 2.40	168	1,050	175
Medical Transportation Management, Inc.														
Missouri Call Center:	\$ 2.43	176	\$ 2.45	175	\$ 2.46	174	\$ 2.47	163	\$ 2.48	162	\$ 2.50	161	1,010	168
Des Moines Call Center:	\$ 2.50	171	\$ 2.51	171	\$ 2.52	170	\$ 2.53	159	\$ 2.54	158	\$ 2.55	158	986	164
RideSource	\$ 2.85	150	\$ 2.80	153	\$ 2.75	156	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	\$ 2.70	149	905	151

NEMT - RFP

Evaluation Team Summary Score Sheet

To be filled out by the Evaluation Team Leader and submitted to the issuing officer.

Evaluator	Ride Source (Bidder name)	Logist Case (Bidder name)	*MR/Access 2 Case (Bidder name)	TMS (Bidder name)	MTM (Bidder name)
1	310	460	430	512.5	490
2	355	502.5	570	565	502.5
3	500	500	585	480	570
4	510	546	508	600	600
5	240	455	462.5	450	517.5
TOTAL Points	1915	2463.5	2555.5	2607.5	2680

Date: 4-30-10

Team Leader Signature: 1

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care / AMR
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes.

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Understand urban vs rural issues, automated system, QA.

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes.

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature [Redacted]		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care / AMR
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:


(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes.

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Will constantly update policy: procedure manual.

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 80%	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care (AMR)
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?


3.2.1. - general description

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Thorough description.

Key Performance Indicators

QA Plan - CSR training, Quality Analyst, QIT, monitor calls, mode of transp reviews, provider oversight, claims audit, customer surveys, PPM

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 70%	Total points 35
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care (AMR)
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Implementation plan - hiring, space, training, manuals, membered, provided.

Provider recruitment, training, qualifications, communication.

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

pg 58 - Description of management during implementation - not the Mgr - specifically on call center staffing levels.

pg. 205 - Account Manager Wayne Stevens.

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Automated system

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes.

Ex - Wheelchair vehicles in TX

E-Reports to communicate w/ providers.

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

will credential these providers & put in their database.

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Prefer real-time feed w/UMIS but if not possible, daily feed.
Use Access 2 Care system once in database.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Call center is bus office in 1A.

English + Spanish.

"sufficient qualified staff" available.

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

M-F 8-5

IVR

Emergency after hrs # + # if waiting more than 30 min.

Voicemail.

Wait time less than 3 min 90% of time.

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Special needs questions in script.

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Trip reservation - automated system.

Re-confirm.

Wait time should not exceed 15 min.

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Provider payment process - pg 37.

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Yes.

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Enter in system, QA Team is Account Mgr.
Respond to every complaint.

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Will flag in system, provide doc / support testimony.
Does not say they represent Dept.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 60%	Total points 240
Evaluator's Signature [Redacted]		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 60% 70%	Total points 280 240
Evaluator's Signature [Redacted]		Date 4/30/10
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care (AMP)
EVALUATOR Number:	1

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Broker & transportation provider.
Yes.

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Some projects address timeliness.
Dismiss complaint rates.
Does not address budget.

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number - Only 2 include phone #
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *Yes*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes.

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes.

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *OK*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *Yes.*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number; *Yes*
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination? **No**

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up? **No**


Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services? **Yes**

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others? **No.**

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 70%	Total points 35
Evaluator's Signature 		Date 4/25/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking

[Faint, illegible text]

Access 2 Care -

- Account Manager - Wayne Stevens
exp w/ state & fed, call centers
- Understand urban vs rural.
- Policy & Procedure Manual - updated constantly.
- Firm would not be a transp provider so no conflict of interest.
- Will locate call center w/in 5m of IME - no projected site.
- Automated system.
- website
- QA - mystery rider, customer surveys, combat fraud & abuse
- Pay 90% of clean claims w/in 10 days, 95% w/in 15, 100% w/in 20.
- Thorough Qx description.
- Adapt PPM to changes.
- Discuss MN clients who have not met spd.
- Less exp as brokerage w/ states, more exp w/ transportation.

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	Access2Care
EVALUATOR Number:	2

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

✓

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

✓

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

✓

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 95	Total points 47.50
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

/

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

yes.

* Flow Chart pg. 32.

/

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 95	Total points 47.50
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

✓

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

✓

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 95	Total points 47.5
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 95	Total points 380
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- a. Project Title
- b. Contact organization name
- c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project?
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

18 yrs. in business

0.005% complaint rate from providers

less than 1% provider No-show (require providers to contact number day before pick up.)

authorized. Clean invoice paid w/i 10 days.

Plan clearly outline implementation dates (pg. 63).

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 95.	Total points 47.5
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

NOD provided w/i 72 hrs of request.

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	American Medical Response	Greenwood Village, Co.
EVALUATOR Number:	3	

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes - well done

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes - well documented

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes - good summary

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes, they clearly know NEMT.

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

Yes, seems to have a way of business that adjusts easily with requested changes

Rapid Application Development - lets ME see impact of reg. changes b4 implementation

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

In depth discussion of each requirement
no real questions

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

AMR has extensive QA coverage

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes - very detailed

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Yes, meets all criteria

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes -

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes, described activities to recruit

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

Yes - will utilize these sources with no problem.

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Yes, will need to figure out best way to interface with State system.

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Yes, local hiring

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Yes - again in detail

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Yes - part of call center questions

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Yes - communication between trans. providers & broker

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Yes, looks pretty straightforward.

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Yes - brochures, informational packets, etc.

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Yes

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 395
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	
EVALUATOR Number:	3

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes -

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

?

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

- Project Title
- Contact organization name
- Contact name, title, and current telephone number
- Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

Looks ok -

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP? *Yes pg. 202*

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes -

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? *Yes*
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? *Yes*

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number;
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

Yes

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

No pg. 223

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

No pg. 223

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

nothing out of the ordinary

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

No answer to this?

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

No.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature		Date 9/27/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

15 trans.
Guidelines changing
ie. configurations
communities?

AMR - 18 yrs -
Call center = project staff based in DSM.

mystery riders!

NYSE - CO.

providers contact client day b4 transport

Medical appt verify pg. 43

begin taking reservation calls on Mon. 9/27

Rapid Application Development expedites change-
definition process & lets IME see impact of
requested changes

CSRs will be trained on actual system they
will use during production

Pending app for Medicaid Eligibility pg. 130?

Either trip is verified b4 w/ med provider or audited
post trip.

Letters
of rec-
GAMS
Molina
HC
Total HC

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	<i>Access2Care</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes - Lists problem we have w/ present system currently. Page 5 area strong

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

*Yes - Largest bus claim + list operations
List experience of their staff*

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes Page 5 + 6 Recognizes Urban vs Rural problems + their relative experience

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points <i>50</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	<i>Access 2 Care</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Yes. Exec Summary details problems faced by RFP RPT brokers accurately, + their plans for addressing problems - call center - rural vs urban

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

*Yes - Plan for written material to be distributed
Maintain a web site + distributed written material*

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% <i>75%</i>	Total points <i>38</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/28/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	<i>Access 2 Care</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Will work w/ DME to establish performance standards to be programmed into their system

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

*Provided QA Spreadsheet used to measure "KPI"
Provided Survey, Questionnaire*

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points <i>50</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/28/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	Access 2 Care
EVALUATOR Number:	4

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements?

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location?

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage?

Yes - In service Requirement Section they offer much detail on their
+ breakdown of tasks to be accomplished at 1
New Detail on Implementation

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

Do not see Account Manager detail but other positions detail
Do not see

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes Page 132-151 Scripts provided ~~for~~ Key details
Uses ~~software~~ to own scheduling software "Access 2 Care"

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

I could not find plan to recruit providers

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

Could not find

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Yes in detail

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

No Except Staffing will be sufficient to meet response times

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Yes. Lots of detail → pg 132-137

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Yes - Part of the call center script pg 134

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Yes Page 151

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

Flow chart and page 43-46

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

Yes - explained directly on pg 154. Referred back to Marketing campaign materials

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes 155 - 160

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

Yes pg 155 - 160

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Could Not find Plan to Recruit Providers

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points <i>320</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date <i>4/12/10</i>
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	<i>Access 2 Care</i>
EVALUATOR Number:	<i>4</i>

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes - ardenwe test - Not finding timeline data Did provide provided contact info p 177

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

Included budget amounts + service

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

Yes w/ provided w/ a b c d

a. Project Title

b. Contact organization name

c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number

d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project? *Yes Extensive description bq's pg 202*
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Yes Wayne Shivers

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Yes - extensive bq's pg 203

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes Extensive description bq's 167

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

- *Yes on CD*
Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability?
- *Yes*
Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference?

Yes

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- Full name, address, and telephone number; *Yes*
- Date established;
- Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations;
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

*Yes
pg 223*

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

No

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

Yes described 223

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

Provided & described pg 23

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

No see later

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

pg 224 No

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points 50
Evaluator's Signature		Date 7/28
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.5 Technical Proposal Evaluation Report

The Department is interested in proposals that provide well-organized, all-inclusive, and technically sound business solutions. Ambiguous explanations will challenge the proposer's credibility and will result in a negative impact upon the bidder's evaluation report.

The Technical Proposal Evaluation Team will compile a Technical Proposal Evaluation Report. The Report will contain, at a minimum:

- A tool to record impressions and other comments (such as follow up questions for the evaluation team) developed during the proposal evaluation for each respective bidder.
- Individual bidder score sheets that will include the individual evaluator scores and the final calculated average score for the bidder
- Compilation of bidder average scores for all bidders, including their final Technical Proposal ranking

1.3.4 Review of Proposal Sections

1.3.4.1 Executive Summary

BIDDER:	AMR / Access2Care
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 4.2.4. Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder clearly demonstrate its strengths and the key features of its proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder presented a comprehensive overview of the services being proposed?

Yes

Has the bidder provided a summary of their strengths and identified the key features of their proposed approach to meet the requirements of the RFP?

Yes for focus on big company behind them disaster recovery

Has the bidder included a summary of its project management plans?

Yes

No acknowledgement of high mileage reimb. component

No mention working with public transit

27 Iowa positions

Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 70	Total points 35
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/29/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

major focus on small family-owned providers

1.3.4.2 Overall Project Understanding

BIDDER:	AMR / Access2Care
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (Continuation from RFP Section 4.2.4 Executive Summary Tab 4)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate in its own words, a clear understanding of the Department's needs?

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements in the RFP?

Executive summary discussion does not seem to reflect understanding of Iowa's emphasis on transit coordination nor the high proportion of mileage reimbursements in Iowa's existing program.

Has the bidder described how they will adjust to accommodate program changes?

7
1

Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100% 60	Total points 30
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28/10
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: OVERALL PROJECT UNDERSTANDING 50	Times the weight 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.3 General Requirements

BIDDER:	AMR / Access 2 Care
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Section 3.2.1 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Consider the bidder's approach to internal quality assurance.

Consider the bidder's description of their NEMT tracking database.

Consider the bidder's description of their electronic billing and invoice system.

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Has the bidder explained their approach to Section 3.2.1 General Requirements and identified each requirement and addressed each requirement?

Yes

Has the bidder satisfactorily described their approach to and scope of their internal quality assurance activities?

Yes

Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 40
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.4 Contractor Responsibilities

BIDDER:	AMR / Access 2Care
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (from RFP Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Service Requirements Tab 5)

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Consider: Did the bidder demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the service requirements? *Yes*

Consider: The bidder's approach to establishment of a call center and a central business office location? *Walk thru process no possible sites discussed*

Consider: The broker's approach to development of a Network plan.

1. RFP section 3.3.2.1 NEMT: Network Providers and Individuals

Has the bidder provided a description of how they will manage the different aspects of the brokerage? *No acknowledgement of Iowa transit coordination policies, focus on HUBS 80% of network*

[preference for providers fully dependent on broker?]

Has the bidder provided the detail describing the level of staff for the Account Manager position, and the call center positions, and do the levels meet the requirements for the brokerage?

27 total ^{Iowa} FTEs

Has the bidder described how they will make the transportation arrangements for all Medicaid Members who qualify for NEMT services?

Yes walk thru iterative process

Has the bidder described how they will ensure the provision of necessary NEMT services by establishing a network of providers through the use of subcontracts?

Yes

Has the bidder described how they will coordinate requests and make decisions on who provides the transportation when Medicaid Members request that someone, other than a Network provider, transport them?

Yes describes process

2. RFP section 3.3.2.2 Verification of Member Eligibility

Has the bidder described their process for verifying the Medicaid Member's eligibility for NEMT services?

Yes good description of process

3. RFP section 3.3.2.3 Office/Telephone Call Center and Appointments Standards

Has the bidder described their staffing plan for the call center?

Yes

Has the bidder described how the call center will operate?

Including scripts / back up

Has the bidder explained their plan to accommodate passengers who have disabilities or special health care needs?

Yes

Does the bidder explain its process to insure that a Member's pick up wait time is according to the requirements specified in the RFP?

Emphasis on notification by provider

4. RFP section 3.3.2.4 NEMT Reimbursement

Has the bidder explained its NEMT reimbursement process?

General: emphasis on AMR's ability to cash flow
and pay provider w/o waiting for payment
from IME

5. RFP section 3.3.2.5 Member Education

Has the bidder explained their process for issuing updates to information provided to Members?

example Brochures website etc

6. RFP section 3.3.2.6 Grievance, Complaints and State Fair Hearings System

Has the bidder described their process for providing Members a grievance and complaints process?

Yes

Has the bidder explained its notice of the right to a Fair Hearing for Members and their role in representing the Department in the hearing?

General

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Good step by step discussion of processes

Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% 80	Total points 320
Evaluator's Signature		Date 4/28
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES 400	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

1.3.4.5 Corporate/Team Experience & Qualifications

BIDDER:	AMR / Access 2 Care
EVALUATOR Number:	5

Evaluation Criteria: (RFP Section 4.2.6 Tab 6)

Consider: The organization experience with similar projects

Consider: Executive level commitment and a demonstration of their commitment in previous projects

1. RFP section 4.2.6.1 Experience

Has the bidder described all services similar to those sought by this RFP that the bidder has provided to other businesses or governmental entities, including all contracts and projects that the bidder currently holds or is working on, with a contact person's name from that business or governmental entity?

Yes

Has the bidder identified if the services were timely provided and within budget?

30 days implementation

Capitated?

Bidder must provide letters of reference, with the following information, from up to three (3) business contacts knowledgeable of the bidder's performance as a primary contractor in providing services similar to the services described in the RFP:

a. Project Title

OK

b. Contact organization name

c. Contact name, title, and current telephone number

d. Brief description of scope of work that demonstrates relevance to this RFP.

Additional information that may be included: Original project start and end dates and Total project value to the bidder's organization

2. RFP section 4.2.6.2 Personnel

Has the bidder submitted a table of organization that describes the following:

Not sure they have any statewide Medicaid brokerages in Texas they were awarded four regional brokerages (out of ?)

- Company's structure, including lines of authority, names and credentials of the owners and executives of the organization and, if applicable, their roles on this project?
- Key personnel, including the Project Manager, who will be involved in providing services for this RFP?

Yes has IDed key Iowa positions
Acct Mgr from Route Match project

Are resumes of key personnel submitted that include name, education, and years of experience and employment history, particularly as it relates to the scope of services for this RFP?

Education ~~was~~ ^{only} included for Acct Mgr

Has information been submitted on other contracts and projects currently undertaken by the bidder?

Yes 13 other projects

3. RFP section 4.2.6.3 Financial Information

Has the bidder provided letters of reference from three (3) banking institutions and/or creditors?

Yes

- Do the letters depict the bidder's financial viability and are they indicative of future financial stability? Yes
- Do the letters provide a contact person and telephone number for each reference? J P Morgan letter has no tele and interest disclaimer

Has the bidder provided the following organizational background information:

- ✓ • Full name, address, and telephone number;
- ✓ • Date established;
- ✓ • Ownership (i.e. public company, partnership, etc.)
- Description of business operations; Access Care brokerage started in 2006? p. 215
- Details of any proposed mergers, acquisitions, or sales that may affect financial stability or organizational structure; and No discussion
- A description, if any, of insurance claims filed within the past five (5) years.
? One bodily injury

4. RFP section 4.2.6.4 Termination, Litigation, and Investigation

During the last five (5) years:

Has the bidder had a contract for services terminated for any reason or has any such contract been subject to any form of default notice or threat of termination?

No

Has the bidder described any damages or penalties or anything of value traded or given up?

No

Has the bidder listed and summarized pending or threatened litigation, administrative or regulatory proceedings, or similar matters that could affect the ability of the bidder to perform the required services?

General comment such exist, but

Have any of the owners, officers, or primary partners ever been convicted of a felony?

do not threaten ability to perform
[Not addressed]

Have any irregularities been discovered in any of the accounts maintained by the bidder on behalf of others?

No

Evaluator Notes Summary:

(Briefly summarize the reasons that best support your evaluation rating.)

Huge company

emphasis on deep pockets / no cash flow problems.

Missing ^{required} statement regarding felony convictions

Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100% <i>75%</i>	Total points <i>37 1/2</i>
Evaluator's Signature		Date
Second Round of Scoring		
Points for this section: CORPORATE/TEAM EXPERIENCE & QUALIFICATIONS 50	Times the Assigned % 0% - 100%	Total points
Evaluator's Signature		Date
RFP Project Director Signature		Date

Texas experience does not involve NEMT eligibility determination